

DA
960
.S77
1920

IRELAND BEATS WILSON

BY
KEVIN STROMA DORBENE
(AN AMERICAN)

WHELAN & SON,
17 UPPER ORMOND QUAY, DUBLIN

357

IRELAND BEATS WILSON

BY
KEVIN STROMA DORBENE
(AN AMERICAN) (pseud.)

JOHN X. REGAN

WHELAN & SON,
17 UPPER ORMOND QUAY, DUBLIN

519207

617
960
577
1920

O'NEILL LIBRARY
BOSTON

TO
EAMON FLEMING,
"ON THE RUN,"
WHOSE WINGED WORDS INSPIRED
THIS BRIEF RECORD
OF TRUTH
FOR AMERICA'S HONOUR
AND
IRELAND'S GLORY

KEVIN STROMA DORBENE
(AN AMERICAN)

IRELAND AND PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

*" But there is hope for my royal love
Of the golden long ago;
Beyond the broad and shining sea
Gathers a stubborn chivalry
That yet will come and make her free,
And hedge her round with gleaming spears,
And crown her queen of all the years;
My own love, my royal love,
Of the golden long ago."*

(*" Ireland "*—Leamy.)

. . . We sympathize instinctively . . . with men who are struggling anywhere for freedom and for the right to govern themselves. In certain quarters to-day it is the fashion to sneer at this American sentiment and to ask why we should sympathize with the Cubans or waste thought upon them. . . . This has ever been the sentiment of America. When the modern friends of Spain in the United States jeeringly ask why we should trouble ourselves about the Cubans or Armenians or Cretans, and go so far afield with our sympathies, they fail to remember the history of their own country. They forget the Congress which, stirred by the splendour of Webster's eloquence, sent words of encouragement to the Greeks. They forget whose sympathies went far across the waters to the Hungarians, and who were the people who brought Kossuth to safety in one of their own men-of-war, while through the lips of Webster they rebuked the insolence of Austria. Sympathy for men fighting for freedom anywhere is distinctively American, and when from fear or greed or from absorption in merely material things we despise or abandon it, we shall not only deny our history and our birthright, but our faith in our republic, and all we most cherish will fade and grow dim.

" Our Foreign Policy "—Henry Cabot Lodge.

WHY NOT IRELAND?

**"I voted for the resolution because I believe
Every man is entitled to his day in court."**

These words of Senator Lodge sum up the American argument in support of the resolution just reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which he is chairman. It was introduced by Senator Borah, and requests that the American delegation at Paris use their best offices to secure a hearing for the Irish delegates appointed to plead at Paris the cause of Irish freedom. It ought to be adopted, and the request it contains ought to be granted by the American delegation at Paris. Jugo-Slavia has had her day in court—in fact, many of them; Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, Ukarinia, Armenia, et al. Why not Ireland?

"Boston Transcript," June 5, 1919.

FOR AMERICA'S HONOUR.

"Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn!"

There is no such thing as the Irish "question." To any unbiassed mind, it is neither "question" nor "problem." From the standpoint of history, from the standpoint of logic, of justice, of philology, of liberty, of unfettered thinking, we should never speak of the Irish "question" or "problem," but of the Irish Cause. The former smack of British propaganda, the latter is redolent of pure patriotism. By British mentality, obsessed with imperialism and imperialistic advantages, Ireland's Sacred Cause is misnamed a "question," or "problem." But we Americans should not think or speak in terms of British imperialism. In the British code of political morality the Empire is super-ethical,—justice, like the devil, take the hindmost.

The force, the ingenuity and wealth of illustration with which British protagonists try to support this immoral thesis is only too evident. Versus Ireland every word they utter or write is one tissue of sophistry. They cannot, nor do they essay to, point out a single flaw in Ireland's claims to complete independence. For whether examined historically or intrinsically, those claims are indisputable; historically, because even under duress the Irish people have never surrendered their right to independent existence nor acquiesced in foreign control; intrinsically, because the Irish Nation *do not* wish to live under the alien British sovereignty. What English imperialists cannot answer they evade. For

they are well aware that to assail these arguments would be to assail implicitly the quintessence of democracy, that "all just government rests on the consent of the governed."

What standard of judgment must we adopt in considering the Cause of *Irish Independence*? There is only one standard for us to adopt, and that is the American standard—the fundamental standard of right and justice. This is the American creed as it is set forth in the Great Declaration: "*We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal: that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.*" Has Ireland been, is Ireland governed in accordance with these principles? Will any man pretend to say that in Ireland all men are regarded by the law as created equal? The very theory of English government is that all men are not created equal. In the practise of government one man is dealt with as better than another. And even to-day the highest position is denied to men who hold a particular faith. A man's liberty is not safe: men are arrested for expressing their opinions and are not only imprisoned without trial by their peers, but without trial or even charge. In the course of seven hundred years, there has not been an hour when it was not the plain right of the Irish people to fight, for the wrong and evil done them constituted just cause for war.

American sense of fair play, a sterling trait of which we are justly proud, is as sensitive to the threnody of Ancient Erin's pleas as the dear harp to the skilled touch of the master's hand. Sagaciously the New York *Sun* pointed this out, April 11, 1917, in the course of a leading editorial:—

"*There is a potent, real sympathy for the Irish cause among our people, who discern in the state of that island a condition very like that which would have befallen the American colonies had the Revolution, led by Hancock, Jefferson, Franklin and Washington, failed of victory.*"

Despite all her propaganda, England must be brought to the realization that the *Sun's* description of the American attitude towards the Irish Nation is both accurate and characteristic of the American people. Not only the lofty motives of gratitude and justice, but also the cogent incentives of race and innate sympathy, should impel millions of Americans *at this hour* so sacred with responsibility, so rich in opportunity, to act independently, to disregard bravely the subtle tergiversations of hectoring imperialists, and to accept no negative reply, no procrastination, no substitute

for the pure article, but to demand the Independence of Ireland, an independence paid for by their wealth and by their blood, an Ireland entirely emancipated from a foreign yoke.

No thinker, of course, can deny that Ireland has been oppressed. No thinker honestly denies that Ireland is oppressed. Irishmen are sometimes told to forget the past. They need not go to the past for proof of English unjust and stupid misgovernment. The present is as stained with British stupidity and criminality as the past. Lloyd George corroborates. Not long ago he confessed that England is as much detested to-day by Ireland as in the days of Cromwell. How unctuous the dear Imperialists become at times, salutarily admonishing the sons of Erin to forget the past. But I affirm that Irishmen *should not forget the past*. Irish history, I dare say, more than the history of any other country, teems with useful lessons. More safely might a mariner throw overboard his chart and compass. Reflecting on the character of that past, they have rather sinned by reticence and indulgence than by exposure and vindictiveness. Even though the Irish would consent to overlook the centuries of grossest inhumanity, there confronts them to-day, this very hour, inexorable proof of the present unjust, disgraceful misgovernment by their ancient enemy.

No close, unprejudiced student of history but knows that the English Empire has *no right* in Ireland; that Ireland has ever risen up against the foreign yoke; that Ireland has never acquiesced in the pretended right of England in Ireland; that the only solution of the perennial Irish Cause that is practicable and honest is for England to pack up her goods and chattels and get out.

Insist we must on a sense of just proportion in Ireland's case, a sense of historical perspective. Let the notable fact be kept ever in sight that the Irish Nation is not on her knees imploring some favor from the British people, but urging with noble dignity before the civilized world her just claims for the restoration of her stolen freedom. Though possessed of the right, Ireland is not asking the redressing of seven centuries of unspeakable wrongs. Devout Ireland leaves that to God. For those wrongs never can there be adequate human compensation. No, not even should England, voluntarily, in a spirit of national repentance, restore independence to Erin, and a sum of money ten times the cost of all this war.

It is difficult to reconcile such an utterance as that of Mr. Taft, cited in these pages, such a knowledge of Irish

history, ancient and recent, and his present attitude of "we must let England settle the Irish question (sic)," with American principles, with candid justice, or intellectual honesty. We are glad Mr. Taft was impelled to express himself at this hour on Ireland. We are certain now where he stands; though he professes sympathy, it is only of the mouth, lip-deep. Plainly he stands with England against Ireland, with the strong nation against the weak, with imperialism against self-determination, with "might is right" against all that America has been fighting for, against the inalienable right of a people to govern themselves. We should and must inform Mr. Taft and those of his ilk that we not only differ from them, but also with all the energy and sincerity of conviction at our command we resent and abhor such treatment of Ireland as being equally unjust and un-American; that good Irish-American (yes, with the hyphen there; the "Irish" does not dilute, but rather concentrates the Americanism) blood made up a very considerable portion of our army and our navy (cf. official publications, especially casualty lists); that these our kith and kin, who saved England and France from defeat, who lie in numberless graves over there, went forth from Irish hearts and homes and over seas, sacrificed themselves and died with implicit trust in American honor, cheered by the thought that America would see to it that Ireland should be independent and free.

The world has moved far forward since the days and times when most of the Presidents cited lived and thought, but fundamentally American principles have not changed. What has changed, very happily, is their power and scope for application.

This is an unique hour, teeming with opportunity for America, an hour challenging national sincerity and integrity. If Ireland attains not her independence, America's primarily will be the shame. In 1776 America projected into the world the soul of self-determination, the Declaration of Independence. That projection cost blood. Ireland before and since then tried the same method again and again, not to gain, but to regain, her Liberty, only to see each attempt end in failure. No, not failure, because every drop of blood spilt, sanctified as it kindled the fires of patriotism. But if ever a people spoke their will, the Irish people have spoken theirs. For in the General Election of December, 1918, Ireland by an immense majority made her decision—without gun or blood, uniquely, by the ballot—

a process as unparalleled in the history of the world as it was dignified and congruous with the world's advance, if the exponents of that advance are sincere. As the Irish nation has been the first to self-determine itself bloodlessly, she should be the first nation to gain international recognition because of that process. Let our own great country, the chief democracy in the world, be the first to do the recognizing.

We Americans realize that the moral position of the Irish people is strikingly stronger than was ours when we separated from the same tyranny. Before the British subjugation the Irish people were an independent nation, with a culture and a civilization vastly superior to England's. We were not independent and had never been. We were colonies. Our revolution was an utter rebellion against legitimate rule, because we wanted self-government; because we did not wish to be governed by people who lived three thousand miles away in another country; because we did not wish to be taxed by the outsider; because we did not wish to pay for an army amongst us to keep us down; because we did not wish an outsider to manipulate our commerce and industries; because, in a word, we did not care to be forced to live under sovereignty under which we did not wish to live and we believed that colonists were essentially the emasculation of manhood, or, as the patriots called their position at that time, "political slavery." If we had justice and right on our side in our revolution against England and in our separation and achievement of independence, how infinitely much more justice and right must the Irish Nation have on their side in their struggle for independence,—the Irish nation whose language, religion and nationality England has tried to stamp out for seven centuries on the pretext that it can rule any people better than they can govern themselves.

Lloyd George, with all his delicacy of verbal touch, let the cat out of the bag. On June 26, 1918, he said: "*We are fighting for the principles Ireland has struggled for . . . the Irish Problem (sic). It has baffled many Governments . . . one Government after another has been baffled by this eternal problem (sic). . . . You are dealing with a problem (sic) of governing a country without ever having had the full assent of its people. This is the most difficult problem in the world. It would be a difficult problem for an auto-cracy. It is almost impossible for a democracy. (!!!) But that is the problem that is entirely baffling every attempt*

made in the direction of the governing of Ireland by the United (sic) Kingdom."

Charles Fox, over a hundred years ago, said about the same thing: "*I have tried to solve the Irish question (sic); I have been unable to do it; and I confess I do not see how anyone can ever solve it.*"

Wendell Phillips answered as every true American should answer: "*There is none (no solution) except the separation of the two islands, and giving Ireland to the Irish.*"

The knowledge of and sympathy for Ireland's wrongs as expressed in the writings or speeches of the Presidents of the United States is what I mainly wish to place before my readers. From these citations they can draw their own conclusions. Neither, for the most part, shall I take up space with comments of my own. I shall call these weighty witnesses and let them speak for themselves.

England holds Ireland, not by the consent of the people, but by brute force. Yesterday it was force, to-day it is force. *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice.*

Kevin Stroma Dorbene—An American.

("I said . . . that one of the principles which America held dear was that small and weak States had as much right to their sovereignty and independence as large and strong States . . . because strength and weakness have nothing to do with her principles.")—Pres. Wilson, May 30, 1916.)

George Washington.

"*Patriots of Ireland! Champions of liberty in all lands!—be strong in hope! Your cause is identical with mine. You are calumniated in your day; I was misrepresented by the loyalists of my day. Had I failed, the scaffold would be my doom. But now my enemies pay me honor. Had I failed, I would have deserved the same honor. I stood true to my cause, even when victory had fled. In that I merited success. You must act likewise.*" (Congressional Record, Vol. LIII, Part v, p. 4275.)

"*I am heartily glad to find that the prosperity of Ireland is on the increase. It was afflicting to the philanthropic mind to consider the mass of people, inhabiting a country naturally fertile in production, and full of resources, sunk to an abject degree of penury and depression. Such has been the picture we have received of the peasantry. Nor do their*

calamities seem to be entirely removed yet, as we may gather from the spirited speech of Mr. Grattan on the commutation of tithes. But I hope, ere long, matters will go right there.

" . . . If Ireland were five hundred miles farther distant from Britain, the case with respect to the former would be speedily and materially changed for the better." (Letter to Sir E. Newenham—Mt. Vernon, July 20, 1788. " Writings of Washington," edited by Jared Sparks, Vol. ix, p. 398.)

" It is with unfeigned satisfaction that I accept your congratulation on the late happy and glorious revolution. . . . If in the course of our successful contest any good consequences have resulted to the oppressed Kingdom of Ireland, it will afford a new source of felicitation to all who respect the interests of humanity.

" The generous indignation against the forces to the rights of human nature, with which you seem to be animated, and the exalted sentiments of liberty, which you appear to entertain, are too consonant to the feelings and principles of the citizens of the United States of America, not to attract their veneration and esteem, **did not the affectionate and anxious concern, with which you regarded their struggle for freedom and independence, entitle you to their more particular acknowledgments.**" —(Letter to Yankee Club, Ireland—Mt. Vernon, Jan. 20, 1784. Ibidem, p. 13.)

(" Shall peoples be ruled and dominated, even in their own internal affairs, by arbitrary and irresponsible force or by their own will and choice?"—Pres. Wilson, Sept. 27, 1918.)

Thomas Jefferson.

" The freedom of commerce between Ireland and America is undoubtedly very interesting to both countries. If fair play be given to the natural advantages of Ireland, she must come in for a distinguished share of that commerce. She is entitled to it from the excellence of some of her manufactures, the cheapness of most of them, their correspondence with the American taste . . . a reciprocal affection between the people, and the singular circumstance of her being the nearest European land to the United States. . . . I am sure they (the United States) would be glad . . . to make that distinction between Great Britain and Ireland, which their commercial principles, **and their affection for the latter,** would dictate." (From Paris, 1785.)

(" . . . Peace should rest upon the rights of people, not the rights of the government—the rights of people great or small, weak or powerful—their equal right to freedom and security and self-government and to participation on fair terms in the economic opportunities of the world."—Pres. Wilson, Aug. 27, 1917.)

(" What we demand in this war . . . is that the world be made . . . safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression."—Pres. Wilson, Jan. 8, 1918.)

John Adams.

" I believe there is no evidence of any contract of the Irish nation, to be governed by the English Parliament . . . ; that the notion of binding it by acts in which it is expressly named is merely arbitrary; and that this nation which has ever had many and great virtues, has been most grievously oppressed. And it is to this day so greatly injured and oppressed, that I wonder American Committees and Congresses have not attended more to it than they have. Perhaps in some future time they may. . . . The Irish nation have never been convinced of their justice, have been ever discontented with them, and ripe and ready to dispute them. Their reasonings have been answered by the ratio ultima and penultima of the tories; and it requires to this hour, no less than a standing army of 12,000, to confute them. . . . Ireland has been frequently revolting . . . and it cannot now be kept under but by force." ("Works," v. 4, p. 165.)

" Ireland is still in a state of fermentation, throwing off the admiralty, post-office and every other relic of British parliamentary authority, and contending for a free importation of their woollen manufactures into Portugal, for the trade to the East Indies, to the United States of America, and all the rest of the world. . . . The Irish Volunteers are also contending for a parliamentary reform . . . and are assembling by their delegates, in a congress at Dublin, to accomplish it. This rivalry of Ireland is terrible to the ministry; they are supposed to be at work to sow jealousies and divisions between the Protestants and Catholics of Ireland." (*Idem*—Letter addressed to the President of Congress, dated London, 1783.)

(" I would rather belong to a poor nation that was free than to a rich nation that had ceased to be in love with liberty. . . . We dare not turn from the principle that morality and not expediency is the thing that must guide us and that we will never condone iniquity because it is most convenient to do so.")—President Wilson, Oct. 27, 1913.)

John Quincy Adams.

" I cannot, however, deny myself the pleasure of thanking you for the testimonial which you have borne to my long-cherished, deeply-rooted respect and affectionate attachment to the people of Ireland and the cause of their national independence, a respect and attachment coeval with the fall of Montgomery before the walls of Quebec in the war of our independence, and confirmed and cemented by the virtues which I have witnessed through the course of a long life, through personal acquaintance with numerous natives of the Emerald Isle." (Letter read by Hon. W. E. Robinson in Congress in 1869.)

(" Shall the military power of any nation or group of nations be suffered to determine the fortunes of peoples over whom they have no right to rule except the right of force?")—Pres. Wilson, Sept. 27, 1918.)

(" Peoples are not to be handed about from one sovereignty to another by an international conference or an understanding between rivals and antagonists. National aspirations must be respected; peoples may now be dominated and governed only by their own consent. 'Self-determination is not a mere phrase.' ")—Pres. Wilson, Feb. 11, 1918.)

Andrew Jackson.

" I feel much gratitude, sir, at this testimony of respect shown me by the Charitable Irish Society of this city. It is with great pleasure that I see so many of the countrymen of my father assembled on this occasion. I have always been proud of my ancestry and of being descended from that noble race. I rejoice that I am so nearly allied to a country which has so much to recommend it to the good wishes of the world. Would to God, sir, that Irishmen on the other side of the great water enjoyed the comforts, happiness and liberty that they enjoy here. I am well aware, sir, that

Irishmen have never been backward in giving their support to the cause of liberty. They have fought, sir, for this country, valiantly, and, I have no doubt, would fight again were it necessary; but I hope it will be long before the institutions of our country need support of that kind." (Address at Boston, Mass., June 22, 1833—p. 29 "The True Andrew Jackson," by C. J. Brady.)

("Shall strong nations be free to wrong weak nations and make them subject to their purpose and interest?"—Pres. Wilson, Sept. 27, 1918.)

("We are a great Nation, a powerful Nation; we could crush some other nations if we choose; but our heart goes out to these helpless peoples. . . . America does not believe in the rights of small nations merely because they are small . . . but we believe in them because when we think of the sufferings of mankind we forget where political boundaries lie, and say, 'These people are of the flesh and blood of mankind, and America is made up out of the peoples of the world.' What a fine future of distinction and glory is open for a people who by instinctive sympathy can interpret and stand for the rights of man everywhere."—Pres. Wilson, Oct. 26, 1916.)

Martin Van Buren.

"To those avowals (on the Rights of Ireland) I can now only add my hearty concurrence in the eloquent and true picture you have drawn. Nine millions of human beings, oppressed for centuries, and with every incentive to violence that can influence the breast of man, 'conquering their appetites and passions,' practising temperance in their social habits, and preserving peace towards their rulers and among themselves, presents a moral spectacle of unsurpassed sublimity. Instances of virtuous patriotism thus far so nobly sustained, are but seldom to be found in the history of mankind, and cannot in the nature of things, fail to command the respect, the sympathy and the best wishes of all generous minds." (Letter written in 1843.)

("Each side desires to make the rights and privileges of weak peoples and small States as secure against aggression or denial in the future as the rights and privileges of the great and powerful States now at war.

"In the measures to be taken to secure the future peace of the world, the people and Government of the United States are as vitally and directly interested as the Governments now at war. Their interest, moreover, in the means to be adopted to relieve the smaller and weaker peoples of the world of the peril of wrong and violence is as quick and ardent as that of any other people or government. They stand ready, and even eager, to co-operate in the accomplishment of these ends, when the war is over, with every influence and resource at their command."—Pres. Wilson, Dec. 18, 1916.)

("We are glad . . . to fight . . . for the rights of nations, great and small, and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and obedience . . . for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations."—Pres. Wilson, April 3, 1917.)

John Tyler.

"I am the decided friend of the Repeal of the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland. I ardently and anxiously hope that it may take place, and I have the utmost confidence that Ireland will have her own Parliament in her own capital in a very short time. In this great question I am no half-way man." (P. 318, Chas. G. Duffy's "Young Ireland.")

("When I speak of the nations of the world, I do not speak of the governments of the world. I speak of the peoples who constitute the nations of the world. They are in the saddle, and they are going to see to it that if their present governments do not do their will, some other governments shall. And the secret is out, and the present governments know it."—Pres. Wilson, after return from Paris.)

James K. Polk.

"All my sympathies are with the oppressed and suffering people of Ireland. . . . I sincerely wish the Irish patriots success." ("Diary.")

("We are fighting for the liberty, the self-government and the undictated development of all peoples, and

every feature of the settlement that concludes this war must be conceived and executed for that purpose. . . . No people must be forced under sovereignty under which it does not wish to live.”—Pres. Wilson, May 26, 1917.)

“No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognise and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property.”—Pres. Wilson, Jan. 22, 1917.)

James Buchanan.

“Is it (England) not a government where the rights of the many are sacrificed to promote the interests of the few? . . . Look at Ireland—the fairest land I have ever seen. Her laboring population is confined to the potato. Rarely, indeed, do they enjoy the wheat or the beef which their country produces in such plentiful abundance. It is chiefly sent abroad for foreign consumption.” “Look at her (England’s) position in regard to Ireland. What is that island at this hour but a magazine of gunpowder, ready to explode at any instant? A single spark may light in a moment the flames.” (Speeches in Congress.)

“The settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement, or of political relationship, upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interests or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its own exterior influence or mastery.”—Pres. Wilson, July 4, 1918.)

“Every people should be left free to determine its own policy, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful.”—Pres. Wilson, Jan. 22, 1917.)

Andrew Johnson.

“Is Ireland’s Catholic isle the nursery of slaves, though her ever-green shamrock no longer wreathes the brows of

her warriors, though her palaces are in ruins, her cities in tears, her people in chains? No! thou didst never cradle a slave; and thy innocent convulsions are but the struggling throes of that inextinguished spirit of liberty which shall yet burst forth with irresistible impetuosity and shake haughty England to her very anchor, though deep down in the main." (Speech in Congress in 1843.)

(" Let us stand by the little nations that need to be stood by.")—Pres. Wilson, Oct. 19, 1916.)

(" An evident principle runs through the whole program I have outlined. It is the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak.")—Pres. Wilson, Jan. 8, 1918.)

Benjamin Harrison.

" We are here to say that, in our opinion, as American citizens, what Ireland needs is not coercion, is not the constable, is not the soldier with musket and bayonet, but liberal laws, tending to emancipate her people from the results of long centuries of ill-government. . . . The period when men might be governed by force—their inclinations coerced, their aspirations . . . suppressed—is passed away for ever. More and more the American idea that government rests upon the consent of the governed is making its way in the world." . . . " We know that Irishmen have many a time in the struggle of their native land, and in our fight in America for constitutional government, thrown themselves upon the bayonet of the enemies of liberty with reckless courage. It is gratifying to know that they can also make a quiet but unyielding resistance to oppression by parliamentary methods. I would rather be William O'Brien in Tullamore Jail, a martyr to free speech, than the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in Dublin Castle." (Speech at Indianapolis in 1887.)

" We hereby express our heartfelt sympathy with the Irish people in their contention for the right which should be freely accorded them. . . . In America this sentiment predominates. . . . The people of Ireland patiently await the outcome. In some localities riot and bloodshed, the natural consequences of oppression, occur; but in the main the people are in hope of a speedy triumph. The American

people are with them in their desire for peace and justice." (Just after his election to the Presidency, General Harrison affixed his signature to this address from the American people.)

(" Shall there be a common standard of right and privileges for all peoples and nations, or shall the strong do as they will, and the weak suffer without redress?"—
Pres. Wilson, Sept. 27, 1918.)

Grover Cleveland.

" It is designed to secure to Ireland those just and natural rights to which Irishmen are entitled. . . . We are here to-night to welcome an apostle of this cause, one who can from personal experience recount the scenes of that troubled isle; who can tell the risks that are taken and the pains that are suffered by those who lead the van in this great movement." (Speech in Buffalo, introducing Fr. Sheehy of Ireland.)

(" Every influence that the American people have over the affairs of the world is measured by their sympathy with the aspirations of free men everywhere."—
Pres. Wilson, Dec. 27, 1918.)

(" We would not dare to compromise upon any matter as the champion of this—this peace of the world, this attitude of justice, this principle that we are the masters of no peoples, but are here to see that every people in the world shall choose its own masters, and govern its own destinies, not as we wish, but as they wish. We are here to see, in short, that the very foundations of this war are swept away. . . . Those foundations were the aggression of Great Powers upon the small. Those foundations were the holding together of empires of unwilling subjects by the duress of arms. . . ."—
Pres. Wilson, Jan. 27, 1919. Address to Peace Conference.)

William H. Taft.

" Ireland and the Irish present a most remarkable picture in the history of the world . . . the history of Ireland from the time of the Norman conquest to the Catholic Emancipation in 1832 is a record, with but few intervals, of misgovernment, intolerance, selfish exploitation and confiscation. The history of Ireland is such that . . . her great

sons were cut off either as martyrs of a rebellion, like Robert Emmet and Wolfe Tone, or were driven to manifest their brilliant intellectual powers and great traits of character in other lands than that of their birth." (Speech in New York, 1908.)

(" In coming into this war, the United States never for a moment thought that she was intervening in the politics of Europe, or the politics of Asia, or the politics of any part of the world. Her thought was that all the world had now become conscious that there was a single cause of justice and of liberty for men of every kind and place."—Pres. Wilson, Jan. 27, 1919.)

Theodore Roosevelt.

" They (the Irish) are a masterful race of rugged character, a race the quality of whose womanhood has become proverbial, while its men have the elemental, the indispensable virtues of working hard in time of peace and fighting hard in time of war." (Banquet of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, 1905.)

(" The fortunes of mankind are now in the hands of the plain people of the whole world. Satisfy them, and you have justified their confidence not only, but have established peace. Fail to satisfy them, and no arrangement . . . will either set up or steady the peace of the world."—Pres. Wilson, Jan. 27, 1919.)

IRELAND BEATS WILSON.

A Golden Rule.

St. Ignatius somewhere laid down as a rule of action that to achieve an object we should ever exert all our energies as if everything depended absolutely on personal effort alone, at the same time with the vivid realisation that we can do nothing without God. All comparisons limp. But Irishmen should strain every nerve to reach their goal, should preach and practice Sinn Féin with all the vigour, energy, and persistency at their command, as though outside aid were impossible, with their souls encouraged by the conviction that friends, especially in America, will see to it that governmental pledges are strictly kept.

Mr. O'Hegarty declares: " It would be a great mistake

to count too much on America." To count too little should be an equally great mistake. Extremes are dangerous. The Ignatian principle contains sound commonsense.

That the heart and arteries of activity should be in Ireland is a mere corollary of the concept, Sinn Fein. "Ourselves," Self-reliance, should dominate every Irish thought, every Irish word, every Irish deed. Just as certainly as Sinn Fein's exalted spirit and genius are above and beyond in ken and purview, mere time, country and party, will its practice spell success.

Mr. O'Hegarty points many conclusions that look like prophecies—conclusions based on premises unfair and sometimes false. No blame can attach to his seeing through Irish glasses, but his vision could be less limited. For the sake of historical truth and in justice I think it unfair to state baldly: "The Irish in America failed to prevent America going to war with Germany in order to save England from defeat."

This is horribly out of perspective. What is extremely complex some would make extremely simple. My point is this—despite their good intentions, I have discovered many intelligent people in Ireland who see but don't see far enough, with a proneness to appraise what Americans have done and are doing for Ireland at a level, to say the least, too low. They possess data, but not enough.

There can be no doubt, I believe, that only through co-operation between those at home and abroad can success be won. At the same time it is obviously to argue in a circle to lay the responsibility for failure at the doors of those whose great desire is and has been, to achieve the common purpose. Instead of taking a too circumscribed view of the matter a straight, direct survey should be made.

To understand the situation and to judge the Irish in America, and to prove how far from the truth are these charges against them, requires careful enquiry into all the important circumstances that influenced and conditioned that situation and the Irish.

How is it Irish-Americans did not prevent the entrance of their Government into the war? How is it that although the majority of the American people were opposed to the same, still their Government went in? The answer to these questions is difficult, and depends on elements of character and psychology and the peculiarities of the American Constitution, factors not always known or adverted to.

American Constitution.

First of all, there is the American Constitution. It divides and apportions the power and duties of government among three branches, the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial. Yet, especially between the Executive and Legislative, there are various intercrossings and interlappings, and even potential conflicts of authority. Under normal conditions all is wont to go well, but as soon as any issue looms large and menacing, on the international horizon particularly, there is hardly any end of struggle, misconception and animus between the President and Congress.

Distribution of Power.

The Constitution gives the President the conduct of foreign affairs. He is to receive and appoint envoys and make treaties. Thus he shapes and directs foreign policy. But his power is not absolute and unqualified. Foreign envoys he may receive, but he cannot appoint any without the Senate's assent. He can negotiate treaties, but their ratification waits upon the Senate's assent. That is the extent to which the Senate participates in the conduct of foreign relations.

The House of Representatives may also participate. Frequently appropriations of money are requisite for the fulfilment of treaties, and they must be voted by the House of Representatives. The Constitution permits no coercion of that body, and, therefore, evidently, it could, if it so decided, defeat a treaty by refusing the appropriation essential for execution.

Again, Congress alone, the two Houses concurrently, can declare war. The President cannot. Yet the President can commit acts of war, or acts which provoke war, and thus can coerce Congress into declaring war or recognising the existence of war which, through the President's acts, has been declared against the nation. *When war is declared*, it must be waged by the President as the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. Congress must declare war, but cannot wage it. The President cannot declare war, but must wage it.

All these peculiarities of the American Constitution must be steadily borne in mind if anyone should fairly pass judgment on the American people, and especially the Irish in America during pre-war and war days.

Defect and Consequence.

I believe that the American Constitution itself contains this serious defect—the virtually unlimited autocracy it confers on the President to map out foreign policy. There is a deplorable lack of effective checks on the President.

From the above, it is evident that the President, Constitutionally, can wield enormous power, especially during a crisis. Once war is declared he becomes practically a dictator. Long before Mr. Wilson was even thought of for the Presidency it had been pointed out by commentators on the Constitution that *a President bent on war could easily force Congress to do his bidding.*

Woodrow Wilson.

Now let us look at what manner of man W.W. was who came into the Presidency. No President was equipped with so full and exact a knowledge of the Constitution. No serious student of events will deny that none of his political contemporaries even approached him in his subtle knowledge of the intricacies and complexities of Congressional Government. Away back in 1885 Professor W.W. published a book entitled “Congressional Government.” Though impregnated with Wilsonian interpretations, it was and is a classic on the subject. It is worthy of remark that this was many years before the future President had even entered the political arena. Once President, Mr. Wilson assumed command, as leader of his party, maintained his personal authority in every move, and supplemented all by a discriminating use of patronage.

First Term.

As a presage of the high-handed way in which he was going to conduct foreign affairs, one need only recall how, in the very early days of his first term, W.W., on his own initiative, and with scarcely even the pretence of consulting either Congress or the country, withdrew the U.S. from all participation in the Chinese Five-Power Loan.

To be brief, an unbroken series of victories is the most accurate description of W.W.’s first term, as between himself and Congress. He swept all before him. He lost no battle. Every victory made him more formidable. During this term Congress was a Party Congress—*i.e.*, the Democrats were in the majority. The president dominated it completely. This idea merits stress because it makes for the intelligibility of subsequent events.

Should anyone be inclined to impugn the veracity of this view of W.'s first term, let him remember how the President committed the Democratic Party to various new policies—*e.g.*, the advocacy of a large army and navy, government of Hayti and San Domingo by protectorate, the purchase of the Danish West Indies. Previously, the Democratic Party had always been anti-imperialistic, evinced by its record on the Philippines, and it had consistently opposed the maintenance of a large standing army. In the espousal and adoption of these, as well as of all his policies, Woodrow Wilson frequently didn't even take the vote of his Cabinet. Throughout even his first four years in the White House, therefore, W.W.'s was a one man Government—a dictatorship.

W.W., The Country and Congress.

Time and time again the whole country was astounded at the President's success in compelling Congress to take the legislative road that he dictated. Time and time again the voice of complaint rose loud against the subserviency of the Congress. No opposition, no matter how recalcitrant apparently, daunted W.W. Demolished it was invariably by his ingenuity or shattered by his superior skill. Now, it was "advantages" he would point out, whose speciousness missed weaker eyes; then it was defects, whose dubiousness lay far deeper than ordinary thought penetrated to. It was like a game. The Congressmen were all adepts—many of them acutely adepts. But W.W. was the expert. He could out-play any adept or any group of adepts. He possessed very consciously the enormous handicap and vantage point given him by the constitution. The apologia of challenged Congressmen has been tantamount to this: They had looked ahead. But the President had seen beyond.

Of all the Presidents, he had proven himself the least accessible and the most aloof. Congressmen he summoned only when he wanted them to do something for him. So changeable did he show himself that he gained the sobriquet of the national weather vane, and was so caricatured. In the matter of Trade Commission, Woman Suffrage, Child Labour Law, and Tariff itself, W.W. completely reversed his policy. Again, all without party consultation.

It is a matter of record that members of Congress were actually deterred from making their usual campaign speeches in Congress during the last few months previous to recess out of fear that the President might change his

policy over night. When the critical hour came—to war or not to war—Congress's awe of Wilson, far from having waned, had almost grown into pusillanimity.

Eve of War.

Look at the state of affairs in America from the day the Great War broke out until the United States entered. While affectedly professing neutrality, the President permitted munitions and war materials of all kinds to be shipped to the Allies. And one cannot ponder or meditate too long or circumspectly on the fact that the ubiquitous slogan of W.W.'s party—the slogan which secured his reelection was: "*He has kept us out of the war.*"

The elections were only over when it became more and more evident that the President's attitude was verging from indecision to bellicosity. The President wrote and exchanged notes. The American Press, subsidised by the English, clamoured for war.

The doubt, the anxiety, and the tense excitement of those days we distinctly recall. Nobody knew whether war was imminent or not. Nobody could say. Vacillating to such a degree had the President shown himself, and so unlimitedly inconsistent, that judgment became a game of hazard. As for Congress—prescinding from the how or the why or the wherefore—it had yielded so often to the President that most people had small hope Congress would or could think and decide for itself.

Wilson—Decisive Cause.

But despite all the anxiety and uncertainty of those momentous hours, one thing is certain, and that is the fact that the majority of the American people were opposed to their Government declaring war. The truth of this statement President Wilson has since admitted. His testimony should quell any doubt. Mr. Frank P. Walsh put the question directly to the President: "Mr. President, did you not realise that the majority of the people of this country were opposed to the declaration of war?" "Yes, I did," was the President's admission.

'Mid a veritable storm of British propaganda bidding for war, in all the darkness of doubt and fear and anxiety created by his own Presidential conduct, 'mid all this, the clever, wily, astute, yes, hypocritical Wilson comes out flat for war. Congress capitulates. Doubt goes. With lightning speed the President becomes dictator in a very

large way. Now he uses every inch of the authority—and more—conferred by the Constitution on a War-President. Before long it is manifest that the President will stop at nothing to accomplish his purpose. There are intermittent complaint and protest here and there, but they quickly vanish before the withering, multiple tyranny of Wilson.

Effect of Constitutional Defect.

Again—the American Government is essentially representative. Once that war was declared there were many intelligent people who shaped their views and policies on the President's. They believed that, as the constitution charged the President with the conduct of foreign affairs his superior knowledge of facts and details of the involved situation must have driven him to urge the declaration of war.

In a Nut-shell.

The nature of the complex situation in America I have briefly outlined. Thence, as from evident premises an inevitable conclusion flows, not indeed with the inexorable logic of mathematical demonstration, but with all the cogent force of moral certitude. What is that conclusion? That conclusion is that *it was Woodrow Wilson alone who brought, yes, coerced America into the war.*

Quickly let me repeat. *Any President could have done this. And from the given characteristics W.W. easily did so.* As none of his predecessors, he possessed the knowledge and had the itch for straining executive power. Without qualm of conscience he stretched the constitution upon his procrustean bed and cut it to suit his every purpose shamelessly.

Not that there were not other agents working for Mars. There were. But all combined, their influence was inconsiderable. There was British propaganda—tons of it. There were the American Tories; they have always been with us. There were some very influential international bankers, as Morgan and Co., etc. No comment is requisite for the first two. The last were strong and powerful. To declare, however, or to fancy, as many people do, that these control Wall Street is a mistake. And the *vast* majority of American financiers were neither eager nor inclined for war. Business projects preoccupied them. The common accusation that Wall Street pressed America into the war is, as a matter of *fact*, I believe, without foundation. America was driven in, W.W. dictating.

W.W.'s British Mentality.

The question naturally arises as to why W.W. joined the Allies? The answer is not far to seek. All his life he betrayed a distinct British bias. Just because of Wilson's British propensities Tammany Hall opposed, almost prevented his nomination at Baltimore. In this, by the by, as in many another instance, the remarkable political instinct and foresight of Tammany Hall was evinced. (As of historical value it is worthy of remark that Judge Cohalan at the time exerted great influence with Tammany.) Years prior to his residence at the White House W.W. had shown his slope of mind in defining the character of the Revolutionary Fathers: "Everything apprises us of the fact that we are not the same nation now that we were when the Government was formed. In looking back to that time, the impression is inevitable that we started with sundry wrong ideas about ourselves. *We deemed ourselves rank democrats, whereas we were, in fact, only progressive Englishmen.*"

Again, it is not a little significant that Viscount Bryce in his "American Commonwealth" cites and lauds W.W.'s interpretation of the constitution. And at the close of his First Administration, a British writer of repute in the "Nineteenth Century" commented thus: "Mr. Wilson had revealed what was in America an *original view of legislative leadership*. His mind moves familiarly amidst English Constitutional and Parliamentary practice. *He conceives of the American Presidency as on its legislative side comparable with the British Premiership.*"

All these facts, all these factors, all these circumstances make for perspective in the formation of proper and just judgment not only of the Irish in America, but of the American people in general. If one examines history one knows that the latter have never been other than anti-British.

In his first term W.W. was a political dictator—in his second he became the most absolute of military dictators.

Victims of Circumstance.

The Irish Race in America? Our people did their best. There was human nature—a truism—but one too often pushed aside by the sciolist. Our people did their best. Our people were sincere. Our people know no slacking in their zeal for the Cause of Ireland. He who says or implies otherwise does not know what he is talking about. Our

people, with the majority of their fellow-Americans, were the victims of circumstance. They, and our people among them, were *forced* to war. Let that fact never be forgotten! Reluctantly they *went in*, with a strong sense of misgiving. To battle on the side of the ancient enemy of their race and of humanity our people were most loathe. They recoiled at the idea. Here *they went in* with remonstrance, there were loud protest. Unmitigated suspicion was the attitude of some. But *war declared*, the great bulk of our own joined the colours feeling morally certain that W.W. was sincere, that he meant what he said without mental reservation, or exception; they threw themselves into the war, brave, noble, chivalrous, as the race ever, with the invincible conviction in their heart of hearts that they were fighting for justice and for Ireland's Independence.

Did not W.W. and his henchmen have a keen realisation of the tone and temper of the American people and of our people among them? Did they not send out an appeal for France, who had helped us? *Appeal for England they dared not*. They knew its futility. The appeal went out for Belgium. The appeal went out for France. The appeal went out, as the whole world knows, and as posterity will know, *for oppressed people everywhere*. Without distinction of race most Americans had faith in the President's sincerity. Some had no trust in the man from the beginning. Among these "some" was I. And the conviction has hardened with time.

How this? Ireland was taboo in all the President's pronouncements. Not one word, definite and determinate, did he utter during the war, on Ireland. Meditating and weighing possible reasons for this with all care and caution, I came with others to the conclusion that there was none, nor a particle of one, to warrant this ominous and cruel silence and injustice. All subsequent events have corroborated this judgment.

W.W. Hypocrite.

I affirm that through it all W.W. was *hypocritical*. Against hypocrisy there is hardly any certain antidote. The hypocrite at any time may deceive. The more exalted, mysterious, and complex his personality and position, the wider is the scope for subtle fraud, dishonesty, and chicanery.

This view I am stressing because it is a strong statement involving a transcendent fact. On the view we take of this man, W.W., hinges the gigantic future. The truth

should be our aim. I don't think we can be indifferent without being culpable.

Woodrow Wilson knew Ireland's case. Thirty-one years ago, in 1889, Professor Wilson, from the seclusion of his study, wrote:—

"The power of the community must support law or the law must be without effect. . . . The majority must acquiesce or the law must be null. This principle is strikingly illustrated in the inefficacy of the English repressive laws in Ireland. The consent of the Irish community is not behind them, though the strength of England is; and they fail utterly, as all laws must which lack at least the passive acquiescence of those whom they concern." ("The State—Elements of Historical and Practical Politics," p. 596.)

"The Government of the United States would deem itself discredited if it had any selfish or ulterior purposes in transactions where the peace, happiness, and prosperity of a whole people are involved."—I am quoting Mr. Wilson again. **"I am glad that there are some simple things in the world. One of the simple things is principle. Honesty is a perfectly simple thing. . . . When I have made a promise as a man I try to keep it, and I know of no other rule permissible to a nation. The most distinguished nation in the world is the nation that can and will keep its promises even to its own hurt."** **"Our principles are well known. It is not necessary to avow them here. We believe in political liberty and founded our great government to obtain it, the liberty of men and of peoples—of men to choose their own lives and of peoples to choose their own allegiance. Our ambition, also, all the world has knowledge of. It is not only to be free and prosperous ourselves, but also to be the friend and partisan of those who are free or who desire freedom the world over."** I am still quoting Mr. Wilson, who knows Ireland's case.

"We are fighting for the liberty, the self-government, and the undictated development of all peoples, and every feature of the settlement that concludes this war must be conceived and executed for that purpose. . . . No people must be forced under sovereignty under which it does not wish to live." I am still quoting Mr. Wilson, who knows Ireland's case. **"Every people should be left free to determine its own policy, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little also with the great and**

powerful." I am still quoting Mr. Wilson, who knew Ireland's case. **"We would not dare to compromise upon any matter of this—this peace of the world, this attitude of justice, this principle that we are the masters of no peoples, but are here to see that every people in the world shall choose its own masters and govern its own destinies, not as we wish, but as they wish. We are here to see, in short, that the very foundations of this war are swept away. . . . Those foundations were the aggression of Great Powers upon the small. Those foundations were the holding together of empires of unwilling subjects by the duress of arms."** I am quoting Mr. Wilson (who knew Ireland's case) at the Peace Conference. **"My friends, the real fruition of life is to do the things we have said we wish to do."** I have finished quoting Mr. Wilson, who knew Ireland's case far better than we dream, who flouted and continues to flout Ireland's cause, the cause of justice, and whose thus sinning convicts him of unparalleled hypocrisy.

The long thirty-one years that have intervened since Mr. Wilson wrote down (as above) his knowledge of English repression in Ireland—the spectacle of the sense of justice and humanity the world over, put on edge by the bloody executions of 1916—the millions of voices of honest men everywhere that have cried out and are crying out to the English in Ireland, "Ye have eaten enough, ye have drunken enough, ye have wantoned enough; it is time for ye to depart,"—the Self-Determining of the Irish people and their declaration of a Republic—England's shameless and iniquitous usurpation of Ireland—unspeakable outrages, murders and crimes by her tools—all these must have driven in deep into Mr. Wilson's consciousness and conscience the injustice and intolerability of English rule in Ireland. Wilson knew Ireland's case. Wilson knows Ireland's case—is silent—disregards American traditions—sins against all his professed principles—and contrary to the advice of the U.S. Senate and Congress and in defiance of the wishes of the American people practices an active pro-British interventionist policy. Is he a fool, nincompoop, or a hypocrite? Reader, choose for yourself.

Before he compelled Congress to declare war he could have easily secured from the British Government the guarantee of the Independence of Ireland. I don't admit that that assertion is questionable. *He did not.* He did not wish to. The same W.W. at Paris could

have made certain and immediate Irish Independence. *He did not.* He did not wish to. *In the light of all these facts juxtaposed with W.W.'s war principles*, the inescapable conclusion, to my mind, is that the President's was a conscious, purposeful insincerity and inconsistency. All the threads gathered together make the hideous skein of hypocrisy. Results are not accidental—they arise from the very nature of deliberate action.

Mr. Keynes, in his masterful book, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace," holds the would-be charitable theory that Wilson was eclipsed and out-distanced by the superior skill and dexterity of European diplomats. But the reasons he alleges for the theory won't hold water. Many of his admissions support my thesis. He concedes, for instance, as all truthful men must concede, that never in the history of the world did a solitary individual enjoy the prestige and the moral influence and have the power right in the palm of his own hands that W.W. did upon his arrival in Paris. And all the elements of his character and the history of his life, his stubbornness, his swiftness of vision, *his sensibility of power*, his penetration, go to prove that W.W. was the last man not to sense this extraordinary prestige, influence and power very intensely. Talk of being out-classed! In the name of reason, what rank nonsense! Mr. Keynes, after all, is a Britisher, first and last. He was in the "know," but, as the scholastics put it, "*secundum quid*"—he had access to the atmosphere and thought of an inner circle, but let it not be imagined for a moment that there were not several more inner circles within which were game-preserves where he could not poach.

W.W. and Privy Council.

Just here let us interject a comment fiercely relevant. Mr. O'Hegarty talks of Horace Plunkett. I fear the latter, like many another entity, receives too much mention. Such as he were better ignored. Is he not an individual who is either an insincere man or a mere puppet? He is a tool of the Cecils, we believe—whether a conscious or an unconscious tool is quite immaterial. As competent students of the British Empire have reiterated again and again, there can be no doubt that this Cecil family have been the *actual* rulers of England since the days of Elizabeth. *These are the inmost ring.* The British Empire is ruled by the Privy Council. In the Privy Council the voice of the Cecils is first, and there is no second. *Did anyone say Secret Society? The most damnable and nefarious Secret Society*

on God's earth is this Privy Council. Open covenants openly arrived at! Vix haruspex haruspicem, Mr. Wilson. Of the living Cecils to-day the master-brain, the genius, is Arthur Balfour. And to-day, as yesterday, the Cecils use their Lloyd Georges, Laws, Carsons, Plunketts, Devlins, and Hendersons. Progress we will by recognising those stubborn things—facts—the truth.

Phenomenal Change.

Mr. O'Hegarty says: "America will no more go to war with England for the sake of freeing Ireland than she went to war with Germany for the sake of freeing Belgium and Serbia." ". . . the Irish abroad can give us no more direct assistance than they were able to give at Easter Week." The suppositum here is all false. Why? (You see that we are fond of giving reasons for the faith that is in us. It used to be a good old custom, but appears to be going the way of all flesh. Blank, categoric statements are quite the vogue.) Why? Because of a simple fact, but a fact of tremendous importance. Because there has been a magnificent change in America from pre-war days. Before we engaged in the European conflict there were comparatively only a small minority of even the Irish in America who were informed on Irish history, especially recent events. This minority were intelligent, energetic and localised. But they were in so vast a population of a hundred and ten millions a comparative few. It would be unfair to state that the majority of the race were not all right "at heart." Knowledge they had of the burning wrongs of dear old Ireland, but it was too vague to eventuate in practicality. The best that can be said of it is that it dwelt in the world of velleities. They should like to help, but there their interest stopped. But ever since America declared war the knowledge of Ireland's history, of interest in the cause of her independence, has extended in geometric progression so as to surpass the hopes and prayers of the most sanguine of what used to be called the extreme section, the minority who always steered for independence. *That progression is phenomenal.* I should almost go so far as to say that the Martyrs of Easter Week are now better known in America than in Ireland. Through the great length and breadth of the United States, in the north and in the south, in the east and in the west, those glorious and noble dead are spoken of with rich praise and deep reverence. We who have lived up to a few months ago through that change can hardly comprehend its vastness or predict what achieve-

ment lies ahead. The picture of the warmth and ardour of the enthusiasm for Irish Independence, and what is more vital and *practical*, the inflexible determination to *see the thing through*, to secure recognition of the Republic through the keeping of governmental solemn pledges, can hardly be overdrawn. No passing fever of enthusiasm, no ephemeral passion of devotion, Irish Independence through American recognition has become their first principle, dominating their life and their thought. There is no fear of their turning back.

Change there has been—I had almost called it a transmutation of outlook, of attitude. The new attitude of the majority has none of the indolence, impracticality, or apathy of the old. Where the intensely earnest and zealous (no half-measure minority) numbered scattered thousands, they are to-day millions on the *qui vive*, serious as impelled by a sacred responsibility, concentrated, organised, united by a singleness of purpose. The goal is clear as the noon-day sun. Until Irish Independence is secured they shall be sleepless.

Exact Status of Cause.

Ireland's cause in America has acquired all the irresistible momentum of the inevitable. Of that assertion I feel as morally certain as I can about anything.

“They (the Irish in America) will never induce America to go to war with England.” It is all very well to be a prophet. But events wait more upon the inexorable law of cause and effect than upon prophecy. “America cannot help us.” This is simply an untruth—and an untruth never gains anything worth while. *America can help. America has helped.* And if Ireland practices the Ignatian principle with which I started this article, America will be the aid *sine qua non* securing Irish Independence soon.

Some Bunkum.

Abstracting, as one should, from bunkum, rot, and imperialistic nomenclature, is the cause for which Emmet and Pearse died a *question*? Have the immortal martyrs of Ireland died to “*settle a problem or question*”? Emphatically not. As elsewhere we wrote: There is no such things as the Irish “question.” To any unbiassed mind it is neither “question” nor “problem.” From the standpoint of history, from the standpoint of logic, of justice, of philosophy, of liberty, of unfettered thinking, we should never speak of the Irish “question” or “problem,”

but of the Irish cause. The former are of British usage, the latter is redolent of pure patriotism. By British mentality, obsessed with imperialism, Ireland's sacred cause is misnamed a "question" or "problem." Should Irishmen speak or think in terms of the Sassenach?

Irish History.

There is an element of truth in Mr. O'Hegarty's distinction that the Irish people in the past fought against and repudiated English rule more by words than by deeds. But we feel bound to protest against this half-truth. We deny that the tolerance and patience of the Irish people were in any sense a political assent or acquiescence. *Human will cannot be coerced.* The will of the Irish people was ever for complete separation. In justice to the generations gone, with due regard to history, with consideration for the human factor, we must affirm that the usurper's fist of mail cowed them, shackled their intellectuality, imprisoned and handcuffed their human activities in ten thousand ways—just as to-day the vice-like grip of the foreigner holds the banks, the railroads, the industries, the giving or the forbidding of the very commercial breath of the country, etc., etc., so that the nation's elected representatives are practically powerless to loosen that grip. Yesterday the Irish people could scarcely function as human beings because of the weight of oppression. To-day there is great, marvellous progress, but it is practically impossible to function politically.

Complete Recognition.

We have been long. Circumstances have made us write scrappily. But we have posited the facts as we know them. We believe in the power of Truth, the whole Truth. We think with Mr. de Valera that this year will not set before the Day of the Dawn.

Our fathers fought the good fight, else we were not! We are blessed with decidedly more itching opportunities.

We are believers in the psychology of optimism. The last lap should arouse our utmost energies.

A very little, little let us do,
And all is done.

KEVIN STROMA DORBENE,
An American—one of the "ill-conditioned."

1984

YIN

BOSTON COLLEGE



3 9031 026 58926 7

